DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 621 HE 006 212

TITLE	Japanese Patterns of Institutional Management in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Hiroshima Univ. (Japan). Research Inst. for Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	43p.; Prepared for the Conference of Member Institutions for the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (2nd , Paris, France, January 1975)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Faculty; *Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Institutional Administration; *Management; Teacher Attitudes; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Hiroshima University; Japan

ABSTRACT

In the fall of 1972, Hiroshima University decided to participate in the OECD/CERI Decentralized Project: Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE). Hiroshima University's Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) participated in the program as a representative research coordinator for the Japanese universities and colleges that were concerned with this research program. More than 1,800 faculty members and more than 150 institutions of higher education responded to questionnaires concerning the problems of institutional management in Japanese higher education. Tentative results of the analysis are categorized according to: surveys on the decision-making structures within institutions of higher education; surveys on the changing structures in institutional management in recent years; and surveys on the attitudes and opinions of faculty members toward the decision-making process. (MJM)

ED101621

OECD/CERI-IMHE

JAPANESE PATTERNS OF INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Progress Report on the IMHE Project

Prepared for the Second General Conference of Member Institutions for the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education to be held in Paris, 20th-22nd January 1975.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

December 1974

IMHE Project Team
Research Institute for Higher Education
Hiroshima University
Hiroshima, Japan

IHE006212

HE 006 212

CONTENTS

Preface ..... (1)

I Outline of the IMHE Project at R.I.H.E. ..... (2)

II Summary of Findings ..... (4)

(1) Research on Institutions - Surveys on the Decision-Making Structures within Institutions of Higher Education

(2) Research on Institutional Change - Surveys on the Changing Structures in Institutional Management in Recent Years

(3) Research on Attitudes and Opinions - Questionnaire Surveys on the Attitudes and Opinions of Faculty Members toward the Decision-making Process

III Concluding Remarks ..... (23)

Appendix:

A. Staff of the IMHE Project Team ..... (25)

B List of Publications ..... (26)

Preface

In the fall of 1972, Hiroshima University decided to participate in the OECD/CERI Decentralized Project: Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE). We participated in this programme as representative research coordinator for the Japanese universities and colleges which were concerned with this research programme. The Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE), a joint research establishment within Hiroshima University, has organized an IMHE Project Team and started the necessary research activities in cooperation with people and institutions concerned with the project. The Ministry of Education and Hiroshima University have financially supported this project.

More than 1,800 faculty members responded to our questionnaires, and more than 150 institutions of higher education offered detailed information and data. Thanks to this favourable cooperation and support, we were able to collect a great deal of important data and information concerning the problems of institutional management in Japanese higher education. We should like to extend our sincere gratitude to all those who have kindly contributed to the progress of the research.

Since this is only the second year of the three-year project, we are not yet in a position to present the final results of our analysis at present. But it is our pleasure to have the opportunity to present a progress report with some of the tentative findings which we have so far obtained. Perhaps by the end of the academic year of 1975 (March 1976), we hope to publish a more detailed account of our findings and conclusions.

This report has been prepared by Kazuyuki Kitamura and Yasumasa Tomoda, the chief researchers of the Project Team, for the Second General Conference of Member Institutions to be held in Paris on 20th-22nd January, 1975.

December 1974

Takehide Yokoo
Director
Research Institute for Higher Education
Hiroshima University

I. Outline of the Scheme of the IMHE Project at R.I.H.E.

Beginning

During the winter of 1972, just after Hiroshima University decided to participate in the OECD/CERI IMHE programme, the Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) organized an IMHE Project Team composed of six full-time staff members (names of the staff are listed in the Appendix A) and immediately started the work on the design of a whole scheme of research schedule. Takehide Yokoo, Director of the RIHE, was named as Representative of the project, and attended the first General Conference of Member Institutions of the IMHE programme held in Paris in January 1973. At this conference, he explained the outline of our research schedule.

During the spring of 1973, the IMHE Project Team developed a more detailed research programme. In May 1973, Professor Burton Clark, an eminent sociologist of Yale University, was invited to the Institute as an advisor of this project, and the whole design of the study programme was tentatively fixed as follows:

Purposes

1) To investigate patterns and practices of the decision-making process in institutional management in Japanese higher education from the perspective of the relationship between "democratization" and "efficiency".
2) To make clear the problems and difficulties with which those who are concerned with institutional management are currently faced.
3) To make several suggestions and proposals for improved institutional management.

The Scheme and Methods

The whole scheme of the project is composed of the following study programmes:

1) Research on Institutions
   Surveys on the Decision-making Structures within institutions of higher education.
2) Research on Institutional Change
   Surveys on the facts of changing structures in institutional management during the recent five years.
3) Research on Attitudes and Opinions
   Questionnaire Survey on the attitudes and opinions of faculty members toward the decision-making process.
4) Case Studies on Institutional Management
   Interview Surveys on the practice of institutional management in about 10 institutions of higher education.
5) Comparative Study
   Research on the models and practices of institutional management

in an international comparative perspective.

Study Schedule

The overall term of the study was tentatively fixed at three years: from April 1973 to March 1976, as follows: --

The First Year (April 1973 - March 1974): Collection and processing of basic data and information concerning especially on (1) Research on Institutions and (2) Research on Institutional Change. Preparation for (3) the Questionnaire Survey.

Second Year (April 1974 - March 1975): Implementation of Questionnaire Survey and its analysis.

The Third Year (April 1975 - March 1976): Implementation of (4) Case Studies, (5) Comparative Study, General Analysis, and Conclusion.

Implementation

During the first year, the IMHE project Team finished the expected two study-programs (1) and (2), and published three interim reports in Japanese editions (see Appendix B). At the same time, the design of (3) Questionnaire Survey was prepared.

During the third year, our main work was the implementation of the Questionnaire Survey of 3,000 faculty members in nearly 150 universities and colleges (excluding junior colleges). By the end of July of 1974, more than 60 per cent of the questionnaires we sent were returned. By the end of October, the first data-processing was finished, and its analysis was made during the winter of 1975.

For the next third year of the study-program, we will implement the other study programs, case study (4) and comparative study (5), and it is expected that the final analysis and conclusion will be completed by the end of the scheduled term, namely March 1976.

II. Summary of Findings

(1) Research on Institutions - Surveys on the Decision-Making Structures within Institutions of Higher Education

In order to make clear the actual conditions under which various decisions have been made within institutions of higher education, it is necessary to collect basic factual data concerning the decision making process. For this purpose, we set about obtaining the following quantitative data which has never been available in our country:

1. The number of decision-making organs and committees established in institutions of higher education both at the campus-wide level and at the faculty (school or department) level.

2. The names and kinds of the decision-making organs and committees.

3. The number of participants in these decision-making organs and committees.

4. The level of activity of these organs and committees (for instance, their frequency of meeting).

In conducting this study-program survey, we selected sample institutions in Japan according to the following criterion:

The sample of institutions of higher education concerned was limited to national, public, and private universities which had 4 year undergraduate programs, and excluded junior colleges and graduate schools. The breakdown of the sample institutions was;

1. National institutions (all) 76

2. Public institutions (all) 33

3. Private institutions (approximately half) 120

We asked all the sample institutions to offer us the necessary information and we obtained replies from:

69 national institutions (rate of reply 91%)

25 public institutions (" 76%)

66 private institutions (" 55%)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(a) The number of decision-making organs and committees

The number of campus-wide organs and committees established within the 159 national, public and private institutions of higher education concerned during the academic year of 1972-73, was reported as 2,285. The rate of establishment was an average 14.3 organs and committees per institution, as shown in the table below:

	No. of institutions replying	No. of organs and committees	No. of organs and committees per institution
National	69	1,268	18.4
Public	25	280	11.2
Private	58	737	12.7
Total	152	2,285	15.3

b) The Variety of Decision-making Organs and Committees

The various decision-making organs and committees established within institutions of higher education surveyed can be categorized as shown in the table below:

Category of Functions	Name of Organ or Committees	Number of Institutions having Organ or Committee		
		National (69)	Public (25)	Private (56)
a. Final Decision-making Organs	University Senate (Hyogikai)	63(91%)	19(76%)	52(79%)
	University Council (Kyogikai)	43(62%)	11(44%)	22(33%)
	Board of Trustees (Rijikai)	-	-	52(79%)
b. Coordinating Organs	Coordinating Council of Deans and Directors	37(54%)	6(24%)	22(33%)
c. (1) "Line" Committees	Finance	25(36%)	10(40%)	11(17%)
	Personnel Policy	12(17%)	10(40%)	13(20%)
	Academic Affairs	24(35%)	11(44%)	30(45%)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	tudent Affairs	28(41%)	17(68%)	32(48%)
	Student Affairs and Welfare	40(58%)	8(32%)	
(2) Inter-Faculty Coordinating Committees	General Educ. Coordinating	13(19%)	3(12%)	5(8%)
	Graduate Education	38(55%)	6(24%)	5(8%)
	Publicity	21(30%)	3(12%)	8(12%)
(3) Governance and Management of Facilities	Facilities	41(59%)	8(32%)	14(21%)
	Dormitories	27(39%)	3(12%)	9(14%)
(4) Ad Hoc Committee for Reform and Innovation	University System	20(29%)	7(28%)	10(15%)
	Reform Commitee	16(23%)		
	Future Planning	34(49%)	8(32%)	10(15%)

(c) Distribution of Organs and Committees by Size of Institution

The numbers of decision-making organs established at the campus-wide level varied from 46 organs and committees at one national university to only two at each of two public and private institutions. These numbers were classified in the table below by institutional size*:

* In our survey the institutional size is defined according to the following criteria:

size	number of faculties (schools)	number of full-time faculty members
A	more than 7	more than 350
B	4 -- 6	approximately 200
C	2 -- 3	" 130
D	1	more than 40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No. of Organs and Committees	National	A	B	C	D	Public	B	D	Private	A	B	C	D
1 - 9	4(5%)	0	0	2	2	9(36%)	4	5	22(37%)	4	1	6	11
10 - 19	37(53%)	9	7	13	8	14(56%)	8	6	25(43%)	4	11	6	4
20 - 29	20(28%)	7	7	3	3	2(8%)	0	2	8(13%)	1	2	2	3
30 - 39	7(10%)	1	3	2	1	-	-	-	3(5%)	1	2	0	0
More than 40	1(1%)	1	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	69	18	17	20	14	25	12	13	58	10	16	14	18

It is clear from the data in the above table that the distribution of organs and committees established in institutions of higher education had no significant correlation with the institutional size. Therefore, it is possible to say that institutional size was not an important factor in determining the number of organs and committees established in institutions of higher education.

(d) The Distribution of Participants

According to the valid replies, number of participants in decision-making organs and committees is distributed as shown in the tables below:

The Distribution of Participants in Decision-Making Organs and Committees

	No. of Institutions (valid replies)	No. of Organs and Committees	No. of Participants
National	49	969	11,153
Public	15	195	1,649
Private	24	433	2,520
Total	88	1,597	15,322

	No. of Participants per Institution	No. of Participants per Organ or Committee
National	228	11.5
Public	110	8.5
Private	105	5.8
Total	174	9.6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The number of participants in decision-making structures at each institution varied from minimum 20 (a private college), through 30 (a public college) and 40 (a national university) to maximum 743 at one national university. It was also the case that institutional size had no significant correlation with the number of participants.

(e) The Activity

In order to obtain quantitative data illustrating an aspect of decision-making activities, we asked all the sample institutions for information on the frequency of meetings of these organs and committees during the academic year 1972-73. The result is shown in the table below:

	No. of Institutions (Valid replies)	No. of Organs and Committees	No. of Meetings in one year
National	64	1,186	7,724
Public	25	280	2,343
Private	56	733	5,931
Total	145	2,199	15,998

	No. of Meetings per Institution per year	No. of Meeting per Organ or Committee per year
National	121	6.5
Public	94	8.4
Private	106	8.1
Total	110	7.3

(f) Number of Organs or Committees and their Distribution by Institutional Size

The institutions of higher education which gave all the information we asked concerning the number of decision-making organs and committees, the number of participants in decision-making processes, and the number of meetings during the 1972 academic year are 85 in total:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No. of Institutions		A	B	C	D
National Institutions	47	10	15	8	14
Public Institutions	15	-	7	-	8
Private Institutions	23	1	7	8	7
Total	85	11	29	16	29

(g) The Correlation

Based on the data from the above 85 institutions, the correlation between the number of decision-making organs and committees, the number of participants, and the level of activity was as follows.

No. of Institutions		No. of Organs and Committees	No. of Participants	No. of Frequency of Meetings per year
National	47	937	10,676	5,857
Public	15	195	1,649	1,493
Private	23	355	2,402	2,454
Total	85	1,487	14,727	9,804

	No. of Organs and Committees per Institution	No. of Participants per Institution	No. of Meetings per Institution	No. of Participants per Committee	No. of Meetings per Committee per year
National	19.9	227	125	11.4	6.3
Public	13.0	110	100	8.5	7.7
Private	15.4	104	107	6.8	6.9
Total	17.5	173	115	9.9	6.6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) Research on Institutional Change

———— Surveys on the changing structures in institutional management during recent years.

The surveys aimed to find out what kinds of institutional changes have occurred in Japanese higher education during recent years since the nation-wide unrest in 1968-69. The data was collected from all the national 4 year colleges and universities. The surveys on public and private institutions are expected to be carried out in due course.

Some of the findings of the survey are as follows:

(a) Number of the Institutions which reported that some form of change in institutional management had been implemented:

	1970	1971	1972	1973	Total
Number of Institutions Reporting	39	62	52	41	194
Percent of all the national institutions*	52%	83%	69%	54%	64%

* The number of all the national 4-year colleges and universities was 75 in 1970-72, and 76 in 1973.

According to the reports from these institutions, the changes seem to have been continuously implemented even 5 or 4 years after the nation-wide campus unrest ended. A majority of national universities and colleges reported some form of changes in institutional management, although the contents of these "changes" should be examined to see whether they were guine reforms or minor changes.

(b) Number of the Institutions reporting that some form of change in the campus-wide decision-making organs ("university level") had occurred:

1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	Total
-	-	1	2	1	5	-	9

Reports of organizational changes in the university senate are quite few in comparison with other changes such as in the election of the university president. The contents of the changes in organization are very minor, as is evident from the fact that the participation of junior faculty members at the university level was not allowed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) Number of Institutions reporting some form of reorganization or new-establishment of campus-wide organs or committees:

Organ and Committee	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	Total
1. Planning		2	1	8	10	21
2. Executive	1	2		2		5
3. Review		2			1	3
4. Coordination		1		1	1	3
5. Publicity	1	6	3		2	12
6. Personnel Policy				5	2	7
7. Finance		1	3	2	2	8
8. Education			1	7	6	14
9. Research	1		2	6	3	12
10. Students		2	2	4	5	13
11. Environmental Affairs		1	2	6	1	10
12. International Exchange				1	2	3
13. University Extension				2		2
14. Admission	1		1	6	4	12
Total	4	17	15	50	39	125

Many institutions had established committees for future planning. If the institutions which had already established such sort of committees are added to the above, the number of institutions concerned with future development is very much increased. Relatively many institutions had newly established committees for publicity, education, research, students, environmental affairs, and admission. This may have some relationship with the improvement and reform in campus-wide communication, quality of teaching and research, and some other student problems, which were called for during the campus unrest at the end of the 1960's. It is also interesting to find that the number of institutions reported some changes had occurred increased in 1971 after two years of the campus unrest.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(d) Changes in the election of university presidents

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	Total
Raising of the Qualifications required	-	-	1	-	1	1	3
Change of the term of the Presidency	1	-	4	2	2	4	13
Extension of the electorate body	1	1	14	8	11	8	43
Expansion of the Recommending body	3	-	1	1	2	7	14
Change in election methods and process	2	-	3	3	10	10	28
Others	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Total	7	1	23	14	27	30	102

The major changes occurred in the extension of the electoral body (41 percent of all the reports), which increased the participation of junior faculty members in the process of election of presidents. 37 institutions reported that research assistants were given a vote in the election. This means that more than half of all national universities and colleges extended participation in the election of presidents to research assistants after the campus unrest.

In the area of student-participation, only a few institutions reported that students had come to be allowed to play a role in the election process on an indirect basis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(e) Reorganization of the faculty meeting

Number of Faculties	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	Total
Expansion of the number of faculty members	2	21	10	7	5	45
Change of the quorum required for the meeting		2	-	-	-	2
Opening of the Proceedings of the Faculty meeting		3	-	-	-	3
Change in the agenda and procedures of the faculty meeting		2	-	4	2	8
Change in the method of faculty appointment		1	-	2	-	3
Establishment or reorganization of the faculty meeting	1	-	2	-	1	4
Total	3	29	12	13	8	65

The reorganization of the faculty meeting increased in the middle of the campus unrest, and nearly half of the national universities and colleges had been reorganized in some manner by the end of 1970. Among the institutions that reported an increase in the number of members of the faculty meeting, the participation of assistants gave the greatest increases.

(3) Research on Attitudes and Opinions
- Questionnaire Survey on the Attitudes and Opinions of Faculty Members toward the Decision-Making Process

a. Introductory Note

The main objective of this questionnaire study is to shed some light on the following problems:

1) what kinds of attitude do faculty members have toward the various activities of university government; how much importance do faculty members attach to university government compared with research, education, and social service?

2) what kinds of problem do faculty members have with respect to the various levels of university government?

3) what kinds of opinion or reform plan do they have for the improvement of the present system of university government?

Since few surveys have been made on university government in Japan, we have tried to cover a wide range of problems instead of concentrating on special problems. But on the other hand, we have tried to concentrate on the problems of how to realize an efficient and decentralized system of government. The following results will show that on the one hand many younger respondents are dissatisfied with the present centralized system, and that they wish to participate more in government. On the other hand, it will be seen from the results that the majority of the respondents are dissatisfied with the present inefficient, time consuming activities of government, and that they presented some realistic reform proposals.

b. Method and Procedure of the Survey

The number of 4-year colleges and universities in Japan was 398 in 1972, and 54,420 full-time professors were working in these 398 institutions (refer to Table A and Table B).

Instead of sampling respondents directly from this population of 54,420 faculty members, first we sampled 155 colleges and universities based on their history, type of institutional control, size (number of professors and faculties), geographical location, and so on giving 63 national, 18 local public, and 74 private institutions. These 155 sample institutions are fairly representative of the various Japanese institutions of higher education. From these 155 institutions we sampled 3,060 faculty members: about 50 percent of these faculty members were sampled randomly from the List of Professors in Japan (Zenkoku Daigaku Shokuin-roku), and the other 50 percent were sampled from the Directory of Governing Bodies and Committees published by each college and university. We used the latter source of sampling, because we considered the responses of those who had experience of university government extremely important.

3,060 questionnaires were sent to these sample professors in May of 1974, and 1,837 questionnaires were sent back by the end of 1974. The response rate was 61%, which was much higher than we had expected.

But in the analysis of our recovered questionnaires, we should be aware of the following characteristics of our sample:

1) Full professors were oversampled. We deliberately oversampled the professors who had experienced some kind of governance, and these experienced professors naturally included more full professors than associate professors and lecturers.

2) Professors in national and local public institutions were oversampled.

This was partly because the response rate in these two types of institution was much higher than that in private institutions, and partly because we deliberately oversampled professors in national and local public institutions in order to compare the responses of professors in these types of institutions with those of private institutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A

Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Respondents' Status and Type of Institution

	National	Local Public	Private	Total
Professor	60%	59%	58%	59%
Associate Professor	33%	32%	29%	32%
Lecturer	7%	8%	12%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Responses	915	237	519	1,671*
	55%	14%	31%	100%

* This figure excludes assistants and invalid replies from the total of respondants (1837) for this tentative computation.

Table B

Percentage Distribution of Faculty Members in Japanese Higher Education by Type of Institution

	National	Local Public	Private	Total
Professor	44	42	49	46
Associate Professor	41	37	26	33
Lecturer	15	21	25	20
Total	100	100	100	100
(Number)	24003	3341	27076	54420
	44	6	50	100

Source: Ministry of Education, Basic School Statistics, 1972. (Excluding professors in junior colleges.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c. A Part of the Findings.

Question 2: Below are the four major activities of university professors. Please write the number 1, 2, 3, or 4 in order of the amount of time you spend on each.

A) All Respondents

Major activity	Percentage Distribution of those giving first ranking
Education	45%
Research	44%
Government	12%
Social Service	0%

B) Responses by Status and Type of Institution

	Major activities	Percentage Distribution of Those Giving First Ranking		
		Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer
National	Education	40%	44%	51%
	Research	41%	55%	49%
	Government	19%	2%	0
	Social Service	0	0	0
Local Public	Education	44%	45%	32%
	Research	37%	53%	68%
	Government	18%	3%	0
	Social Service	0	0	0
Private	Education	59%	59%	58%
	Research	29%	36%	34%
	Government	13%	5%	8%
	Social Service	0	0	0

Question 3: Below are the major activities of professors. Please circle the three activities on which you wish to spend the most time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A) All Respondents

Activity	Percentage Distribution of Activities Circled
Research	32%
Government	4
Lecturing	30
Reform	7
Counseling	16
Social Service	8
NR	3
Total	100

12

46

B) Distribution by Status and Type of Institution

	Activity	Percentage Distribution of Activities circled		
		Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer
National	Research	32%	33%	33%
	Government	7	1	1
	Lecturing	31	32	31
	Reform	8	6	8
	Counseling	16	15	14
	Social Service	5	11	8
	NR	2	2	5
	Total	100	100	100
Local Public	Research	31	33	32
	Government	8	1	2
	Lecturing	31	31	28
	Reform	9	10	11
	Counseling	13	16	18
	Social Service	7	6	9
	NR	2	1	2
	Total	100	100	100
Private	Research	31	32	31
	Government	7	2	1
	Lecturing	30	31	32
	Reform	7	7	2
	Counseling	15	18	20
	Social Service	7	9	11
	NR	3	2	3
	Total	100	100	100

Question 4: If you have so far had experience in a position such as that of president, trustee, academic councilor, dean, director, or department chairman, please answer the following question. To what extent are your research and teaching activities impeded by the activities of governing?

Greatly impeded	33%
Impeded	45
Not impeded	22
Total	100

Question 5: It is said that time spent on committees has recently increased. Is this the case in your faculty?

Increased	75%
Not increased	17
Other	8
Total	100

Question 5-2: If you encircled 1 in the above question, please circle what you consider to be the two main reasons among the following:

Decentralization of Government	20%
More problems to be solved	32
Formalization of Democracy	26
Unskilled Operation of Meeting	18
Other	3
NR	1
Total	100

Question 16-7: We should try to decentralize university government in each university or college, but the more important problem is how to achieve more efficient organization of university government. Do you agree?

Agree	80%
Disagree	5
Neutral	12
Don't know	2
NR	1
Total	100

Question 16-4: Colleges and universities have grown so big and complex that we should train professional administrators or managers of higher education. Do you agree?

Agree	52%
Disagree	18
Neutral	24
Don't know	5
NR	1
Total	100

Question 14: Do you think it necessary to improve the working conditions of those who are in such government positions as dean, dean of student, etc.?

Necessary	75%
Unnecessary	3
Neutral	20
Don't know	2
NR	1
Total	100

If you think necessary, please circle all the necessary improvements.

	Necessary
Better financial compensation	44%
Decreased teaching load	59
Employment of a secretary	52

Question 8: To what extent do you feel your opinions are taken into account in the decision-making in the faculty-meeting?

A) All Respondents

Fully	20%
Partly	59
Hardly	18
NR	2
Total	100

B) Percentage Distribution by Status and Type of Institution

		Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer
National	Fully	35%	11%	10%
	Partly	61	68	56
	Hardly	3	21	33
	NR	1	1	2
	Total	100	100	100
Local Public	Fully	33	6	5
	Partly	60	68	53
	Hardly	7	25	42
	NR	0	1	0
	Total	100	100	100
Private	Fully	25	6	2
	Partly	66	57	45
	Hardly	8	35	48
	NR	1	3	5
	Total	100	100	100

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question 16-6: Not only professors, but associate professors, lecturers, and assistants should participate more in the central governing bodies. Do you agree?

A) All Respondents

Agree	37%
Disagree	27
Neutral	34
Don't know	1
NR	1
Total	100

B) Percentage Distribution by Status and Type of Institution

	Percentage agreeing		
	Professor	Associate Professor	Lecturer
National	20%	48%	67%
Local Public	25	49	58
Private	30	53	61

Question 12-8: The discretionary power of the president is so limited that he cannot assume responsible leadership. Do you agree?

Agree	21%
Disagree	45
Neutral	20
Don't know	12
NR	2
Total	100

Question 15-1: Do you think it necessary to establish a body or a staff group in order to help the president?

Necessary	64%
Unnecessary	29
Other	7
Total	100

Question 15-2: If you think it necessary, what sort of organization do you recommend?

Formal Post such as Vice President	42%
Informal Advisory Group	51
Other	0
NR	7
Total	100

Question 13: Are you satisfied with the activities of the central governing bodies of your university?

A) All Respondents

Satisfied	56%
Dissatisfied	41
Other	3
Total	100

B) Percentage Distribution by Status and Type of Institution

	Percentage Distribution of those 'Satisfied'		
	Professors	Associate Professor	Lecturer
National	71%	50%	35%
Local Public	66	39	42
Private	64	39	39

III. Concluding Remarks

The following are some tentative conclusions which can be drawn from the data collected by these three study-programs by the end of 1974:

(a) During the academic year 1972-73, sample Japanese institutions of higher education reported that each institution had on average at least about 17 campus-wide decision-making organs, composed of on average about 10 members per organ, meeting on average 6.6 times annually. It has been general tendency for the number of campus-wide dicision-making organs, the number of participants in these organs, and the frequency of meetings gradually increase since the campus unrest at the end of 1960's. Although the distribution of organs, the number of participants, and the frequency of meetings seem to have no clear correlation with institutional size, national universities and colleges generally have a greater variety of organs, a higher number of participants, and a greater frequency of meetings by comparison with public and private institutions.

(b) The main characteristics of the institutional changes occurring within the campus-wide decision-making structures of national universities and colleges during the years from the end of the 1960's to the beginning of the 1970's were:

(1) Some form of institutional change was implemented continuously in more than half of the national universities and colleges in Japan during the years from 1970 to 1973. Although the contents of the "reforms" should be examined in more detail, it should be noted that a substantial number of institutional changes were initiated even several years after the campus unrest of 1968-69.

(2) One of the most important changes was seen in the extension of the participation of junior faculty members (including assistants) in decision-making organs at various levels (especially the faculty meeting and faculty committees), as well as in the process of election of university presidents and deans of faculties. "Democratization" in the sense of increased participation of junior faculty members in institutional management was formally promoted during these years.

(3) On the other hand, the student participation in institutional management was implemented very little, in spite of the fact that the need for expansion of student participation had been so violently demanded either by students themselves or by many reform faculty committees established during the time of campus unrest.

(4) A great number of committees were newly established or reorganized many institutions in the last five years. Among them were com-

mittees for publicity, education, research, student matters, admission, and environmental affairs. The establishment of these committees seems to have a close relationship with the issues of conflict during the campus unrest of the 1960's.

(c) The only data we have so far obtained are the percentage distributions of the responses of the aggregate total and some cross-tabulations of responses by respondents' status (full professors, associate professors, and lecturers) and by the type of the institutions (national, local public, and private). From these first results, we have drawn the following tentative concluding remarks:

(1) Faculty members' main concerns are education and research, and they are quite indifferent to the activities of university government. Since each college and university has grown so big and their structures have become so complicated, we can expect that the activity of government will become more and more important. Nevertheless, few faculty members want to contribute to this kind of activity. The important problem is how to improve the working conditions of the managers, administrators, or governors of universities.

(2) After the radical students' movement at the end of the 1960's, many committees and other governing bodies were established, and more and more of the time of faculty members was spent on meetings and government. It is natural that not a few of the professors' educational activities should have been impeded by the activities of government. The majority of professors wished to establish more efficient systems of government.

(3) Junior faculty members (associate professors and lecturers) were dissatisfied with the present system of institutional management governed by full professors and they wish to participate more in decision-making process.

(4) Therefore, on the one hand we have to decentralize the present system of university government more in each institution, but on the other hand, we have to establish a more efficient system of university government. Decentralization and efficiency are in a sense incompatible. If we decentralize the present system more we have to establish more meetings or committees, and this may lead to more time consuming activities for faculty members.

(5) However, many faculty members presented practical proposals for reform. For instance, they said it was necessary to train professional administrators of higher education, to improve the working conditions of presidents, deans, directors, and so on.

(6) On the other hand, we have to inquire into the concept of "efficiency."

Appendix A

STAFF OF THE I M H E PROJECT TEAM

Representative	Takehide Yokoo, Director, R.I.H.E.
Research Group	Masao Seki, Professor, R.I.H.E.
	Kazuyuki Kitamura, Associate Professor, R.I.H.E.
	Jiro Ikehata, Associate Professor, Hiroshima University
	Yasumasa Tomoda, Associate Professor, Hiroshima Agricultural Junior College
	Yoshiki Hayashi, Graduate Fellow, Hiroshima University
	Tohru Umakoshi, Research Assistant, R.I.H.E.
Collaborators	Ikuo Amano, Associate Professor, Nagoya University
	Makoto Aso, Associate Professor, Osaka University
	Buichi Ebara, Instructor, Nara University of Education
	Katsuya Narita, Head Researcher, National Institute for Educational Research
	Masami Maki, Senior Researcher, National Institute for Educational Research
	Masahide Yamasaki, Associate Professor, Hokkaido University
Advisors	Burton R. Clark, Professor, Yale University
	William K. Cummings, Assistant Professor, University of Chicago

Appendix B

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

As of December 1974

No. 1 (0 - 1)
Outline of the I M.H E Project. (March 1974. Japanese edition, 12 pp.)

No. 2 (I - 1)
A Survey on the Decision-making Structures within Institutions of Higher Education. (Institutional Research I - Campus-Level) by Kazuyuki Kitamura (March 1974, Japanese Edition, 41 pp.)

No. 3 (II - 1)
Preparatory Report on Changes in the Decision-Making Structures within Institutions of Higher Education. (Reform Survey II - 1. National Universities) by Masao Seki (March 1974, Japanese Edition, 18 pp.)

No. 4 (III - 1)
Questionnaire Survey Sheet (A Survey on the attitudes and opinions of faculty members toward the decision-making structures in institutions of higher education.) (March 1974, Japanese Edition, 12 pp.)

No. 5 (0 - 2)
Japanese Patterns of Institutional Management in Higher Education - A Progress Report on the IMHE Project (Prepared for the Second Conference of Member Institutions for the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education) (December 1974, English Edition, 26 pp.)

1975

Hiroshima University

Hiroshima University was founded in 1949 as the only government-supported university in Hiroshima Prefecture, but its earliest history goes back to the beginning of this century.

The University has nine different faculties (including schools of medicine and dentistry), and each faculty, with one exception, has a graduate division. In addition, the University has several research institutes. Approximately, 10,000 students are now studying under 1,300 members of the teaching staff. In size, the University ranks eighth among the government-supported universities in Japan.

The University performs the double function of training specialists, thereby promoting advanced research in Japan and of furthering cultural efforts in the area in which the University is placed.

At present, the University has several campuses in various parts of the prefecture, but the proposed plan for the unified campus has been approved by the Government, and construction will soon begin at Saijo in the central part of Hiroshima Prefecture. It is expected that the new campus and the proposed reform program will open a new page in the history of the University.

The Raison d'Etre of the Institute

It is widely accepted that universities today are facing a situation in which there is an urgent need to reexamine every phase of their activities, from education to research and from management to administration. This situation has been created by such factors as the rapid growth of new fields of learning, the explosive demand for higher education, and the appearance of a new generation of questioning students with their multiple demands.

Despite this need for reexamination, universities in Japan have lacked the capacity to tackle this problem, which includes above all the objective scrutiny and evaluation of universities by themselves. Lacking this capacity, universities are totally unable to adapt themselves to the needs of the time, much less to reform themselves on the strength of their own intellectual activities. In other countries, especially in the United States, numerous research organizations dedicated to the improvement of higher education have been established, and in Japan, the urgent need for a similar organization has been voiced by many educational leaders who believe that universities must demonstrate a greater responsiveness to the changing environment.

The Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University intends to fulfil this need. It is the first of the kind to have been created in Japan, and its primary function is to carry out continuous study of ways to improve the performance of universities in Japan.

A Brief History of the Institute

This Institute was officially recognized by the Ministry of Education on May 1, 1972 as a 'joint education and research facility within a national university' as stipulated in Ordinance No. 19 of the Ministry of Eudcation. This was the first occasion in the history of Japan when a body devoted exclusively to the study of higher education had been granted such recognition.

Previously to this official recognition, the core of the present Institute had been created in the following steps. On September 18, 1969, the Reform Committee of Hiroshima University proposed the establishment of a special research group dedicated to the study of university problems in its *Preliminary Proposal for Reform* issued in the most turbulent year in the history of the University. In November of the same year, this proposal was accepted by the governing body of the University, and the Committee for the Establishment of a University Problems Research Center was organized. The Center itself was established in February 1970, and its research activities began in the summer of the same year with a handful of research associates who joined the Center on a part-time basis, and three full-time research assistants and with affiliated researchers from outside the University.

After about two years of its activity, the importance of this center was widely recognized, and it was strengthened with one full-time associate professor and one full-time secretary, till on May 1, 1972 the Center was officially recognized under its present name. The Institute has since experienced two major expansions. In April 1973 the chairs of one full-time professor and one visiting professor and one visiting associate professor were officially granted, and in the following year, another full-time secretary was added to the staff together with a considerable increase in the number of affiliated researchers from outside the University.

The present size of the Institute, however, is far from being adequate to pursue its research objectives. In the immediate future, the Institute will have to concentrate its efforts on the study of problems arising within the limits of Hiroshima University, but the Institute is working towards the status of a national research institute. At the same time, the Institute is hoping to gain international recognition through co-operation with organizations dedicated to similar objectives abroad.

The Organization and Management of the Institute

Since the Institute is a common facility for the whole university, its basic policy is decided by the R.I.H.E. Policy Committee, composed of 18 members including the President of the University and the Deans of the respective faculties among others. Concrete measures for realizing this basic policy are decided by the Executive Committee composed of 16 members including representatives from various sectors of the university as well as from the Institute itself.

The actual staff for carrying out the Institute's objectives currently consists of 56 people. These include the Director of the Institute, five full-time research staff (one professor, one associate professor and three assistants), eighteen research associates who divide their time between the Institute and their respective faculties, and 26 affiliated researchers who have their principal status in organizations external to Hiroshima University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Staff of RIHE

as of July, 1974

Director:	YOKOO, Takehide	(Professor, Faculty of Education)
Professor:	SEKI, Masao	(Science Education)
Associate Professor:	KITAMURA, Kazuyuki	(Higher Education)
Research Assistants:	WATANABE, Sōsuke	(History of Japanese Higher Education)
	UMAKOSHI, Tōru	(Higher Education in Asian Countries)
	KAWAKAMI, Shōgo	(Science Education)
Research Associates:	AGARI, Ichirō	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences)
	FUJII, Toshihiko	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Education)
	IMANISHI, Ichiji	(Professor, Faculty of Dentistry)
	IRISAWA, Hiroshi	(Professor, Faculty of Medicine)
	KOSE, Kuniharu	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Engineering)
	KUROKAWA, Masaru	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences)
	MARUYAMA, Masuteru	(Professor, Faculty of Engineering)
	NAGAI, Hideaki	(Assistant, Research Institute for Theoretical Physics)
	NINOMIYA, Akira	(Lecturer, Faculty of Education)
	OGAWA, Shuzō	(Professor, Faculty of Science)
	OTSUKI, Kazuo	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Education)
	SHIRAISHI, Risai	(Professor, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences)
	SUNAGAWA, Yoshikazu	(Professor, Faculty of Political Science & Economics)
	TAGUCHI, Kazumi	(Professor, Faculty of Medicine)
	TSURUOKA, Eiichi	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences)
	YAMATANI, Yōji	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Fisheries & Animal Husbandry)
	YUASA, Nobuyuki	(Associate Professor, Faculty of Literature)
Affiliated Researchers:	AMANO, Ikuo	(Associate Professor, Nagoya University)
	ASŌ, Makoto	(Associate Professor, Osaka University)
	FUSHIMI, Kōji	(Vice-President, Science Council of Japan)
	HAYASHI, Takeji	(President, Miyagi University of Education)
	ISHII, Kanichirō	(Associate Professor, Kyoto University)
	KAWAKITA, Jirō	(Director, Kawakita Research Institute)
	KAWANOBE, Satoshi	(Senior Researcher, National Institute for Educational Research)

	KOBAYASHI, Tetsuya	(Professor, Kyoto University)
	MAEKAWA, Tsutomu	(President, Hiroshima Institute of Technology)
	MAKI, Masami	(Senior Researcher, National Institute for Educational Research)
	MINAGAWA, Takuzô	(Professor, Kanagawa Junior College of Hygiene)
	NAGAI, Michio	(Editorial Writer, Asahi Shimbun Press)
	NAKAGIRI, Daiyû	(Professor, Dôshisha University)
	NAKASHIMA, Naotada	(Professor, Kyûshû University)
	NAKAYAMA, Shigeru	(Lecturer, University of Tokyo)
	NARITA, Katsuya	(Head Researcher, National Institute for Educational Research)
	OGATA, Ken	(Professor, Hôsei Univeristy)
	OHGIYA, Sho	(Professor, Osaka University)
	SATO, Tadao	(Critic)
	TAWARA, Otoyori	(Associate Professor, Tôhoku University)
	TERASAKI, Masao	(Associate Professor, Rikkyo Univeristy)
	TOMODA, Yasumasa	(Associate Professor, Hiroshima Agricultural Junior College)
	UEYAMA, Yasutoshi	(Professor, Kyoto University)
	USHIOGI, Morikazu	(Associate Professor, Nagoya University)
	UTSUMI, Iwao	(Professor Emeritus of Hiroshima University)
	YAMAZAKI, Masahide	(Associate Professor, Hokkaido University)
Administrative Staff:	KASEDA, Tadayoshi	(Secretary General)
	YAMADA, Setsuo	(Executive Secretary)
	MATSUMOTO, Kazuko	(Secretary)
	ISHIKI, Kazuko	(Librarian)
	OHTA, Chokuko	(Assistant Secretary)
	NUNOZAKI, Mariko	(Assistant Secretary)

The Function of the Institute

Stated in abstract terms, the function of the Institute is to investigate higher education through the efforts and co-operation of researchers within and outside the university (Article 2 of the Institute Rules). More concretely, however, the functions of the institute may be divided as follows:

1) To organize and co-ordinate study projects on higher education by promoting co-operation among individual researchers within and outside the university including those in foreign countries.

2) To collect and classify basic data on higher education.

3) To share information with researchers in related fields especially for the purpose of university reform.

4) To take an active role in promoting wider understanding of the nature of higher education within and outside the university.

The Research Activities of the Institute

Research activities conducted at the Institute can be divided into the following four different types.

1) Individual Research Projects to be planned and executed by individual researchers.

2) Group Research Projects to be planned and executed by groups of researchers on specific problems for limited periods of time.

3) Co-operation with researchers abroad and participation in international research activities on higher education.

4) The sponsoring of the annual study meeting of the Institute and other lecture meetings, symposia and seminars on higher education.

Individual Research Projects in Progress

A historical study on the differentiation of universities	(Takehide Yokoo)
A study of general education for scientists and engineers	(Masao Seki)
A comparative study of American and Japanese mass higher education	(Kazuyuki Kitamura)

A historical study of foreign students in Japanese higher education	(Sosuke Watanabe)
A study of higher education in Korea	(Toru Umakoshi)
A study of curriculum in teacher-training faculties and colleges	(Shogo Kawakami)
English as a foreign language in Hiroshima University	(Nobuyuki Yuasa)
A study of teacher-training curriculum	(Kazuo Otsuki)
A study of entrance qualifications in Western Germany with sepcial emphasis on "Numerus-Clauses"	(Akira Ninomiya)
Theories of Teacher-training	(Toshihiko Fuju)
Problems of university finance	(Yoshitomo Sunagawa)
A survey of motivation for physics education	(Shuzo Ogawa)
Merits and demerits of the so-called coherent education for medical students	(Hiroshi Irisawa)
A study of dental education	(Ichiji Imanishi)
A historical survey of technical teachers' training courses	(Masuteru Maruyama)
A historical analysis of technical education	(Kuniharu Kose)
Agricultural education in universities	(Yoji Yamatani)
A study of mathematics curricula in general education	(Risai Shiraishi)
Physical education in European and American universities	(Eiichi Tsuruoka)
A study of students' course determination	(Ichiro Agari)
Government policy on science and technology and the establishment and growth of attached institutes	(Hideaki Nagai)
A study of students' entrance motivation and changes in their school-morale	(Masaru Kurokawa)

Group Research Projects in Progress

I. Student Life
   a) Basic studies on unviersity dormitories (a group of 6 researchers)
   b) A study of students' course determination (a group of 16 researchers)

II. University Education
   A study of basic education and general education for scientists and engineers (a group of 37 researchers)

III. Graduate School Education and Research
   Present condition and future prospect (a group of 16 researchers)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. Institutional Management in Higher Education
Administrative systems in Japanese universities ..... their analysis, classification and comparison with the administrative systems of foreign universities (a group of 12 researchers)

V. Teacher-Training
A study of teacher-training curricula
(a group of 14 researchers)

In addition to the above projects, the following minor study projects are in progress

a) Problems of English language education on the university level ..... a survey from the students' side
(a group of 4 researchers)

b) A historical survey of the student unrest and the subsequent five years of university reform (a group of 5 researchers)

c) A preliminary study for medical education curriculum reform
(a group of 6 researchers)

International Co-operation

The Institute participates in OECD/CERI activities as a representative of Japan. It also promotes international co-operation and exchange between Japanese universities and foreign universities, sponsoring lecture meetings and seminars from time to time. It helps individual researchers to get in touch with other researchers, especially with those in foreign countries, in the same field or in related fields. Finally, the Institute participates in Unesco activities and other activities in Europe in the capacity of a joint reasearcher and collaborator.

Study Meetings and Seminars

The Institute sponsors an annual meeting of staff members for the discussion of current topics and exchange of opinions. This is the biggest event of the Institute and public lectures are usually given on this occasion. In addition, the institute sponsors seminars on university education to discuss various problems related to it. Reports are read and discussed in these seminars, often in the presence of an international expert on the subject. Finally, the Institutes holds small study meeting where slides are shown and short lectures are given.

The Publications of the Institute

The institute issues the following publications to disseminate the results of research.

(1) *Research in Higher Eudcation (Daigaku Ronshu)* is a collection of academic essays and research reports on higher education, to be issued once or twice a year.

(2) *Notes on Higher Education* is a collection of short interim reports, bibliographical notes, translations of important foreign documents, etc, to be issued from five to seven times a year.

(3) *The Record of The Annual Staff Meeting* is a collection of papers and reports read at the annual meeting of the Institute, to be issued once a year.

The contents of the back numbers are as follows:

RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION (Daigaku Ronshu)

(With English abstracts)

No. 1 (March 1973)

M. Terasaki:	A Historical Review on KOZA-SEI (the Chair System) in Japanese Universities (I)
M. Shimbori:	Study Report on Academic Productivity
K. Kitamura:	Development of the Academic Research on Higher Education in the United States ..... An Introduction
S. Nakayama:	The Impact of Modern Science upon Universities.....(I)
T. Yokoo and H. Kondo:	University Reform Movement in the Nineteenth Century's England
K. Chiyoda:	A Historical Analysis of the "Göttingen Sieben": German University, Constitution and Political Power (1819 – 1842)
S. Watanabe:	A Study on Asian Students and Higher Education in Japan

Abstracts

No. 2 (March 1974)

T. Yokoo:	The Origin of Professor's Salary-System
K. Kitamura:	The Success and the Crisis in American Graduate Education – From the ≪Golden Age≫ to the 1970's. –
Y. Tomoda:	Post-war Trends and Problems of Japanese Graduate Schools
K. Chiyoda:	A Historical Analysis of the "Göttingen Sieben" – – German University, Constitution and Political Power (II) –
S. Nakayama:	The Impact of Modern Science upon Universities ..... (II) Ecole Polytechnique and the Formulation of Modern Engineerings Science
M. Terasaki:	A Historicalal Review on KOZA-SEI (the chair-system) in Japanese Universities (II)
S. Watanabe:	A Study on Asian Students and Higher Education in Japan – A case study of the students from Formosa under the rule of Japanese Colonialism –
U. Teichler:	Kurzstudium in der Bundesrepublik Deutshland
S. Ijima:	Forms of Institutional Establishment in Japanese Higher Education

Abstracts

Notes on Higher Education

(Japanese Edition only)

No. 1 (Aug., 1971) The Curriculum of the University of Sussex-I, Edited and translated by Research Institute for Higher Education

No. 2 (Sept., 1971) Survey on the Institutes and Faculty Member in German Universities, By Harumi Kondo

No. 3 (Oct., 1971) Selected Periodicals on Higher Education 1971 [in Foreign Languages]Edited by Satoshi Iwamura

No. 4 (July, 1972) The Medical Curriculum in European and American Universities, Edited and translated by Yoshio Sugihara

No. 5 (Aug., 1971) Basic Data on Main Universities and Colleges in the United States of America, Edited and translated by Masao Seki and Shogo Kawakami

No. 6 (Feb. 1973) Curricula of the University of Sussex: Schools of Arts and Social Studies...from the Handbook 1966/67, Edited and translated by Research Institute for Higher Education

No. 7 (March, 1973) Compiled Regulations of University Dormitories in Japan; Edited by Research Institute for Higher Education

No. 8 (Aug., 1973) German Present Situation of University Reform and Students with Particular Reference to Marburg University, By Kan Chiyoda and Shuhei Sakaguchi

No. 9 (Sept., 1973) Documents Relating to the Dispute in the Hiroshima University School of Medicine, with Special Reference to the Organization of the Medical Staff and Post-graduate Program and Degree, Edited by Yoshio Sugihara

No. 10 (Jan., 1974) A National Survey on Biology Education...With Reference to the Curriculum at the Departments of Biology, Faculties of Science, By Shogo Kawakami

No. 11 (Feb., 1974) A Bibliography on Graduate Education and Research in Japan, Edited by Kazuyuki Kitamura

No. 12 (Feb., 1974) Regulations and Bylaws on Graduate Courses and Academic Degrees in Japanese Universities, Edited by Kazuyuki Kitamura

No. 13 (March, 1974) Liberal Learning for the Engineer-Report of the ASEE Humanistic-Social Research Project by American Society for Engineering Education, Edited and translated by Masao Seki

No. 14 (March, 1974) Compiled Regulations of University Dormitories in Japan (2), Edited by Research Institute for Higher Education

No. 15 (June., 1974) (1) A Survey on the Freshmen's Consciousness of Agricultural Cources in Colleges and Universities concerning their Entrance Motives and an Image of Agriculture, by Yoji Yamatani.

(2) A Survey of the Consciousness of Agricultural Upper Secondary School Students on their Career Selection and Agriculture: A Comparative Study with General Upper Secondary School Students, by Yoji Yamatani

Information Service

The library of the Institute primarily collects the following types of materials: (1) important Japanese and foreign books and journals on higher education, (2) bulletins and calendars of Japanese and foreign universities, (3) reform proposals and reports relating to higher educational institutions. The library is open both to members of Hiroshima University and to other people wishing to use it. In addition, in so far as it is possible, we offer a reference service to researchers on higher education. The bibliographical report of the library is published every other year.

The library is rapidly expanding, but as of April, 1974, it had the following materials:

Books Japanese	3,171	4,729 books
Foreign languages	1,558	
Magazines (Japanese)		31 titles
Magazines (foreign)		40 titles
Newspapers (Japanese and foreign)		18
Student Rosters (〃)		825
University Bulletins and Calendars (〃)		1,793
University Reform Reports (〃)		980